



**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
GREENVILLE DIVISION**

MATTIE SARAH ELIZABETH WILSON,	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
vs.	§	Civil Action No. 6:20-02087-MGL
	§	
SOUTH CAROLINA TELCO FEDERAL	§	
CREDIT UNION BANK; CHAD OLIVER;	§	
TERESA VALAYE; SYVANNA; and	§	
KATE PATTERSON,	§	
Defendants.	§	

---

**ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION  
AND DISMISSING PLAINTIFF'S AMENDED COMPLAINT WITH PREJUDICE  
AND WITHOUT ISSUANCE AND SERVICE OF PROCESS**

---

Plaintiff Mattie Sarah Elizabeth Wilson (Wilson), proceeding pro se, filed this amended complaint against the above-named Defendants, purportedly based on federal question jurisdiction.

This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (Report) of the United States Magistrate Judge recommending Wilson's amended complaint be dismissed with prejudice and without issuance and service of process. The Report was made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made, and the Court

may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). The Court need not conduct a de novo review, however, “when a party makes general and conclusory objections that do not direct the court to a specific error in the [Magistrate Judge’s] proposed findings and recommendations.” *Orpiano v. Johnson*, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982); *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b).

The Magistrate Judge filed the Report on August 27, 2020, the Clerk of Court docketed Wilson’s objections on September 16, 2020, as well as an interlocutory appeal to the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals the same day. On February 22, 2021, the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals dismissed Wilson’s appeal for lack of jurisdiction, and the mandate issued on March 16, 2021. This Court, on April 1, 2021, provided Wilson an additional fourteen days to supplement her objections. Wilson failed to file any supplement to her objections. The Court has reviewed the objections, but holds them to be without merit. It will therefore enter judgment accordingly.

As noted above, this Court need not conduct a de novo review of the record “when a party makes general and conclusory objections that do not direct the court to a specific error in the [Magistrate Judge’s] proposed findings and recommendations.” *Orpiano*, 687 F.2d at 47; *see also Howard v. Sec’y of Health & Human Servs.*, 932 F.2d 505, 508–09 (6th Cir. 1991) (holding that general objections are insufficient to preserve appellate review).

In this case, the Court concludes Wilson’s objections amount to general contentions with the Report’s findings, and merely repeat claims the Magistrate Judge properly considered and addressed. Inasmuch as the Court agrees with the Magistrate Judge’s detailed treatment of those issues in its well-written and comprehensive Report, it need not repeat the discussion here.

Wilson was warned of the consequences of failing to file specific objections. *See* Report at 13 (“The parties are advised that they may file specific written objections to this Report , . .

and [o]bjections must specifically identity the portions of the Report . . . to which objections are made and the basis for such objections.”). In that Wilson failed to make specific objections to the Report, this Court concludes she has waived appellate review.

Consequently, because Wilson neglects to make any specific objections, and the Court has found no clear error, it need not make a de novo review of the record before overruling her objections and accepting the Magistrate Judge’s recommendation.

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case pursuant to the standard set forth above, the Court adopts the Report and incorporates it herein. Therefore, it is the judgment of the this action is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE** and without issuance and service of process.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Signed this 9th day of February 2022, in Columbia, South Carolina.

s/ Mary Geiger Lewis  
MARY GEIGER LEWIS  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

\*\*\*\*\*

**NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL**

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this Order within thirty days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.